DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 942 JC 720 116

TITLE	People for the People's College: Community-Junior College Staff Development, Priorities for the 70's. A Summary.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	19p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Teachers; *Educational Needs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Junior Colleges; Preservice Education; *Staff Improvement; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development reviews and evaluates federal programs relating to the training and development of educational personnel, and this summary of their report identifies personnel needs of community-junior colleges. Several major topics are discussed: (1) the uniqueness of these colleges, reflected by their democratic-humanitarian principles, (2) the special, atypical students these colleges serve, such as the under-educated, veterans, and minority groups, (3) the need for more staff members who are qualified, competent, and dedicated, (4) the non-existent or inappropriate preservice and inservice education programs for college staff, and (5) the need for increased funding for imaginative and effective educational programs. Specific recommendations deal with the development of creative and well-designed inservice programs, using innovations such as consultants, model programs, and statewide staff development programs. These, together with preservice programs, will aid staff in their special role. It is concluded that failure to implement the necessary programs will result in an inadequate educational system. (RN)

ED 061942

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PEOPLE FOR THE PEOPLE'S COLLEGE

Community-Junior College Staff Development

Priorities for the 70's

- A Summary -

JC 720 116

A Report of the
National Advisory Council
on Education Professions Development

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 8 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development
Room 308, 1111 - 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development was established by Public Law 90-35 in June of 1967. Members are appointed by the President. The Council is charged with the review of the Education Professions Development Act and of all other Federal programs for the training and development of educational personnel. Reports of findings and recommendations are made to the President and to the Congress.

Members of the Council submitting this report are:

Larry J. Blake (Vice Chairman)
President, Flathead Valley
Community College
Kalispell, Montana

Jennie A. Caruso
Dean of Women
Maple Heights West Junior
High School
Maple Heights, Ohio

Jon William Clifton, B.D.
Louisville
Kentucky

Howard Coughlin
President, Office and
Professional Employees
International Union
New York, New York

George O. Cureton
Reading Consultant
East Orange, New Jersey

Rupert N. Evans
Professor of Vocational
and Technical Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Hertzel Fishman
President, Sciences and
Arts Camps, Inc.
New York, New York

Sidney Hook
Professor of Philosophy
New York University
New York, New York

Marvin D. Johnson
Vice President for University
Relations
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Ted F. Martinez
Director of the Student Union
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Paul H. Masoner
Dean, School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Janet Morgan
Guidance Director
South St. Paul High School
South St. Paul, Minnesota

Lucius H. Pitts
President, Paine College
Augusta, Georgia

Mary W. Rieke (Chairman)
Member, House of
Representatives
Oregon State Legislature
Portland, Oregon

* * * * *

Joseph Young - Executive Director

INTRODUCTION

The statute which established the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development charges this body with the review and evaluation of Federal programs relating to the training and development of educational personnel. As a consequence of this broad charge, the Council is concerned with all levels of education -- pre-school through graduate and professional school; the full range of subject matters and disciplines; a number of categories of educational personnel; and myriad forms of training and development.

No aspect of our responsibilities has concerned -- and intrigued -- us more than the community-junior college. A number of meetings have been devoted to the personnel needs of this important part of the higher education system. Last fall the Council outlined the broad dimensions of this topic, and commissioned Professor Terry O'Banion, University of Illinois, to prepare a draft report based on the concerns identified by the Council. In January of this year, the Council reviewed the draft and, with appropriate revisions, approved the final report.

The full report is two hundred fifteen pages in length. This summary has been prepared to highlight major findings and recommendations.

The University of Arizona Press will publish the full text of the report, with publication scheduled for October.

Mary W. Rieke
Chairman
National Advisory Council
on Education Professions
Development

People for the People's College

A Summary

In 1900 no public community-junior colleges existed. Seventy years later every state in the nation had a community-junior college. In 1970 approximately 2,500,000 students attended 1,091 community-junior colleges. This was four times the number of community-junior college students and twice the number of colleges in 1960. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education predicts that 450 additional community-junior colleges may be needed by 1980. The phenomenal growth of these institutions in the past decade will continue for the next decade and possibly beyond.

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development has long recognized the rapid growth and the social impact of the community-junior college. Members of the Council believe that the community-junior college is one of the most important social developments to have emerged in American society during this century. The Council further recognizes that if the community-junior college is to meet the demands placed upon it by this society, the most potent and creative staff available will be required.

As a consequence of its deep concern about this subject, the Council has submitted a report to the President and to the Congress identifying the personnel needs of these institutions and outlining actions appropriate to meeting these needs.

A summary of the major findings and recommendations of this report follows:

I. Community-junior colleges are special kinds of educational institutions, in some ways similar to, but in some important ways vastly different from, secondary schools and four-year colleges and universities.

The community-junior college is an American social invention based on democratic-humanitarian principles. It is the institutional representation of the American ideal of individual and equal opportunity. It is often called "Democracy's College."

The community-junior college is an "open door" institution; all citizens are given an opportunity to attend college. Comprehensive programs are provided: transfer, career, general education, continuing education, and developmental education. The college is based in the community and responds to the needs of the community, providing leadership for community renewal and rehabilitation.

The community-junior college has made, and will continue to make significant contributions to the national goals of American society. Dale Tillery of the University of California, Berkeley, has compared national goals and community-junior college contributions as follows:

NATIONAL GOALS	COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS
EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY THROUGH EDUCATION	Open door to diverse programs at a low cost for youths and adults
NATIONAL ECONOMIC GROWTH AND WELL-BEING RESULTING FROM ADEQUATELY TRAINED MANPOWER	Well-planned and taught programs to provide for technical, managerial, and professional skills at several levels
EXPANDED OPPORTUNITIES FOR FULL INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT	Opportunities for guided exploration of educational and career alternatives, and for relevant education
INCREASED EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS WITHIN COORDINATE SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION	Comprehensive programs, including preparation for students unprepared, unwilling or financially unable to enter senior colleges at first matriculation
PROFESSIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICANS OF MINORITY BACKGROUND	Increasing opportunities as teachers, counselors, and administrators for Americans of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds
ENHANCED QUALITY OF LIFE IN AN INCREASINGLY AFFLUENT SOCIETY	Community centers for cultural, intellectual, and personal renewal

II. Community-junior college students are special kinds of students, similar to their counterparts in other educational institutions, but significantly different in a wide range of characteristics.

The community-junior college student is Everyman. He is John Q. Public. He is the "constituency" for every public official. A reporter for American Education says that,

> Junior college and community college students come from every walk of life. They are young, middle-aged, and old. They compise all races and national origins. Most of them probably would never have seen the inside of a college classroom had not a two-year college been spawned in their immediate locale. The two-year colleges have brought together a somewhat incongruous assortment of classmates. It is not unusual to see a mini-skirted teenager studying alongside a middle-aged working man. Or a mother and son pursuing a two-year associate degree in the same program. Or a uniformed policeman trying to order his lecture notes . . . Who is the junior college student? The student is a housewife whose educational career was interrupted by marriage and family. Or a bright but poor youngster who works and studies while living at home. The student is a ghetto kid with limited opportunities, or a youngster whose middle-class family wants him closer to home for a couple of years before sending him away to the big university. The student may even be a local physician attempting to catch up on new information about drugs in an evening course or in a Saturday class. Perhaps the only answer is that the student is one of over two and one-half million people who are lapping up everything these colleges can put out.

Within this great variety of students who attend the community-junior college a number of special groups of

students are served.

The community-junior college has made a commitment to the under-educated of this nation that no other institution of higher education has ever dared make. It is estimated that 30 to 50 per cent of community-junior college students are in need of developing basic skills. But if community-junior colleges are to provide greater success for these students than has been true in the past, instructors with special preparation who believe these students can learn will need to be recruited in great numbers.

Approximately 400,000 veterans use the community-junior college as an opportunity for further education and as a point of re-entry into private citizenship. In some community-junior colleges 25 to 50 per cent of the full-time male students are veterans.

The community-junior college also provides opportunities and special programs for minority groups: blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and impoverished whites. Approximately 16 per cent of enrollments in public community-junior colleges is made up of students from minority groups. In some large, urban community-junior colleges the minority enrollment is 30 to 50 per cent. One of the most important challenges in the 70's is to provide programs for these students.

III. <u>There is great need for an increasing number of community-junior college staff members who are especially qualified to serve these kinds of students in these kinds of institutions.</u>

Given the mission of the community-junior college and the challenge of the community-junior college student, the quality of the teaching-learning process is of paramount importance. In 1960, James Thornton warned that "either the community-junior college teaches excellently or it fails completely." Unlike the research-oriented universities, the community-junior college has always emphasized quality teaching above all other functions. For this reason, the community-junior college is often called the "Teaching College."

The highly qualified teacher required for the "Teaching College" must be strongly committed to the purposes and objectives of the community-junior college. This teacher must be highly competent in his subject matter specialty, and he must be highly competent in the effective communication of his material and ideas to students. Furthermore, the good teacher believes that all human beings can learn; he is deeply committed to the facilitation of human development -- on a variety of levels in a variety of ways. His style is to challenge, encourage, support, stimulate,

encounter. He is knowledgeable, creative, imaginative, and innovative. This teacher is essential if there is to be any validity to the idea of the "Teaching College."

In 1970 approximately 122,400 staff members worked in community-junior colleges. By 1980, 216,000 staff members will be required. During the 1970's, therefore, 93,700 additional staff members, of which 16,000 will be administrators and service personnel, will be needed. At least 9,370 new staff members will be needed each year for the next ten years. It is imperative that these new staff receive the education which will enable them to meet the high standards required for the success of the community-junior college.

IV. <u>While there are some promising programs currently available in universities and community-junior colleges, programs for preservice and inservice education are mostly non-existent, or inappropriate where they do exist.</u>

The President of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Joseph W. Fordyce, comments on the inappropriateness of most present university programs,

> Community-junior colleges have been required to a very large extent to remold and remake university graduates so that they can perform adequately as teachers at the community college level. The emphasis upon research and other non-teaching

> functions and the insistence upon an ever increasing degree of specialization in the graduate schools of our nation has largely had a neutral if not actual, negative influence upon the preparation of graduate students for the function of teaching and counseling in America's community colleges.

Joseph Cosand, U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Education and former President of the Junior College District of St. Louis, is even stronger in his criticism,

> There are practically no strong preservice collegiate programs for community college staff members, and those that are provide only a small fraction of the qualified personnel needed. Increasing numbers of so-called preservice programs have been established, but they are generally inadequate or worse than nothing.

It has been estimated that present preservice programs place only about 150 new faculty in the community-junior colleges each year. For example, in the EPDA 1971-72 Part E programs (institutes, short-term training programs, and special projects) only two programs for 75 personnel were especially designed for the preservice education of community-junior college staff. There is certainly no surplus of teachers being prepared for the community-junior college.

While the need for preservice programs is important, programs for the 70's should focus on inservice education. All of the 122,400 staff members employed by community-junior colleges in 1970 need continuing inservice educational

experiences. Some community-junior colleges provide no inservice opportunities; most provide an orientation program preceding the beginning of fall classes; some even provide for periodic programs during the year and allow staff members to attend off-campus programs; too few colleges provide a well-designed strongly supported, total institution inservice program.

Although EPDA Part E gives priority to inservice programs, in 1971-72 only 3,453 staff members participated in institutes, short-term training programs and special projects designed specifically for the community-junior college. An additional 2,578 staff members participated in similar programs, but these programs were designed for staff members from community-junior colleges and four-year colleges. Assuming that half the participants in these two-year/four-year programs were from community-junior colleges, only 4,742 community-junior staff members were provided inservice experience under EPDA in 1971-72. Therefore, only 4 per cent of the existing 122,400 staff members benefited from the inservice education portion of EPDA at a cost of $4,224,217. If only 25 per cent of present staff were to be provided inservice experience under this portion of EPDA, and if costs remained the same, expenditures have to be increased by $17,500,000.

V. Imaginative and potent educational programs for community-junior college staff which are supported by the federal government, state and local governments, four-year colleges and universities, community-junior colleges, private foundations, and other appropriate agencies must be continued where they do exist and organized and developed where they do not, if the community-junior college concept is to survive at all, much less grow and mature in its contributions to American society.

This summary report is not a specific blueprint for action. It does not suggest specific programs for specific agencies. It does not suggest funding packages. It does outline the need and indicate directions for the development of community-junior college staff. While the full report contains many recommendations, the following are considered to be the major priorities for the 70's.

Two major recommendations provide the framework for those listed under Inservice and Preservice Programs:

(1) While the development of new preservice programs for the preparation of community-junior colleges is important in the 1970's, priority should be given to the development of a variety of creative and well-designed inservice programs.

(2) In both preservice and inservice programs, priority should be given to staff development which helps serve the special needs of students who are at a disadvantage, either for socio-economic or educational reasons. Special attention should be given to the recruitment of minority staff members, not only for special programs, but also for service in transfer, career, and counseling programs, as well as in administrative positions.

Inservice Programs

(1) Every state should have a staff development program coordinated by the educational unit in the state which is responsible for community-junior colleges. It should be the purpose of the state program to insure that every college has a staff development program. The statewide program developed in Florida could serve as a national model.

(2) Every staff member in every community-junior college should have a professional development plan, individually tailored in terms of the goals and resources of the college and the needs of the individual staff member. Such a plan should be developed in consultation with appropriate college officials and should form the basis for staff evaluation.

(3) The most creative and potent staff development programs in community-junior colleges should be identified to serve as models. Descriptions of these models should be disseminated and opportunities for visitation should be provided.

(4) The most creative and potent programs in remedial and developmental education, staff evaluation, student personnel, media centers, use of behavioral objectives, instructional technology, and other pertinent areas should be identified, information about them disseminated, and opportunities provided for visits to examine these programs.

(5) Highly competent consultants in all areas in which personnel development is needed should be identified and information regarding their experience and expertise should be made available.

(6) Programmed packages on the history and philosophy of the community-junior college, the nature and characteristics of community-junior college students, innovations in teaching, and a variety of other areas should be developed to complement inservice programs.

(7) The proposed Institute of Higher Education, or other appropriate agencies, should study the professional development needs of various community-junior college

staff groups to identify the major needs of new career and mid-career staff.

(8) A study should be undertaken to determine the in-service opportunities available to community-junior college staff through the Area Manpower Institutes for Development of Staff; the regional education laboratories; business, labor, industry training centers; universities and community-junior colleges; and other agencies.

(9) A variety of institutes, workshops, retreats and forums on a variety of topics should be offered to community-junior college staff throughout the year in major regions of the country. The Danforth summer institute and the Bennett Conference are models to be duplicated.

(10) If these recommendations are to be acted upon, a coordinating agency should assume responsibility for nationwide planning to insure development of the types of programs most in demand and most needed by community-junior college staff. A major university, The American Association of Junior Colleges, or a special community-junior college unit in the U.S. Office of Education could be the coordinating agency.

Preservice Programs

(1) Selected universities should be funded to develop model preservice programs for community-junior college staff. These programs should be designed specifically for community-junior colleges. The Kellogg-supported Junior College Leadership Program for administrators should be expanded, and similar models developed for instructors, student personnel workers, and other education specialists.

(2) The Advanced Teaching Degree should become the model degree for community-junior college instructors. Programs similar in goals to those of the Doctor of Arts in Teaching, but designed for community college teaching, should be developed in major universities and especially in the new upper division universities.

(3) A few universities should develop special programs for special staff to include Multi-Ethnic Program Coordinators, Remedial and Developmental Staff, Staff Development Officers, Human Development Specialists, Multi-Media Specialists, Instructional Technology Specialists, Health Occupations Staff, Community Outreach Program Coordinators, and Coordinators of Cooperative Education Programs.

(4) Qualified community-junior colleges should design and test programs to prepare paraprofessionals to work in the community-junior college. Programs are needed to prepare counselors and teacher aides, media technicians, learning center aides, and aides to staff college-based child care centers.

(5) Special year-long institutes should be developed in selected universities to provide special orientation to the community college for those who hold the Ph.D. and are not employed in four-year colleges, and for new staff from business and industry for the community-junior college.

(6) The outstanding community-junior colleges which are staffed by master community-junior college instructors and administrators should be identified. These colleges should serve as internship sites for preservice programs.

Conclusion

If the community-junior college is to grow in quality as it has in quantity; if the needs of minority groups are to be met; if the under-educated are to have a second chance; if the needs of business, industry, and government are to be provided for; if communities are to be given opportunities for renewal and rehabilitation; if all citizens are to be given opportunities to explore, extend, and experience their

hopes and dreams -- then it is imperative that immediate and considerable attention be given to the educational needs of those who staff "Democracy's College". Failure to implement programs based on these priorities will mean the continuation of a system of education that is inadequate for the needs of this society. Furthermore, if the community-junior college does not help satisfy some of the major social needs of the 1970's, then energies will be used to develop new kinds of educational institutions which do. For, in the next decade, educational institutions will be challenged to meet social needs as they have never been challenged in any period of human history. The community-junior college has the commitment and the programs; if society provides the staff and other resources, the human condition can be advanced dramatically in the 1970's.